

# FDS Pokémon Battle Prediction 2025: Team Eeveelution Report

Michelangelo Crea (1993024)

Lorenzo Musso (2049518)

Giulia Pietrangeli (2057291)

## Abstract

*This report details our system for the FDS Pokémon Battles prediction 2025 competition. The architecture is an ensemble of three gradient boosting models: CatBoost, LightGBM, and XGBoost. A key aspect was developing unique, model-specific feature engineering pipelines to maximize ensemble diversity. We explored two primary ensemble methods: a "Level 1" stacking approach (producing two submissions from a Logistic Regression model and a "best model" selection process) and a simple blending ensemble.*

## 1. Feature Engineering & Base Models

Our approach relied on creating three independent "Level 0" models, with diversity driven primarily by distinct feature engineering (FE) pipelines.

### 1.1. CatBoost Pipeline

This pipeline executed a multi-phase FE process. Key feature categories included:

- **Dynamic Battle Aggregates:** Tracking HP, faints, and stat boosts over time.
- **Static Matchups:** Comparing the lead Pokémon's types against the opponent's lead.
- **Move Characteristics:** Analysis of STAB, healing, and status-inflicting move properties.

All categorical features were processed using One-Hot Encoding.

### 1.2. LightGBM Pipeline

A second, distinct feature set was engineered for LightGBM. Notable features included:

- **Battle Momentum:** Calculating the slope and volatility of the cumulative HP advantage over time.
- **Information Advantage:** Tracking the number of Pokémon "revealed" (seen) by each player.
- **Timeline Summaries:** Aggregate features such as damage dealt in the first 2 turns.

### 1.3. XGBoost Pipeline

The XGBoost pipeline created the same feature set as LightGBM. Other important features that we created are:

- **Team Role Analysis:** Identifying the "fastest sweeper" or "bulkiest wall" on the team.
- **Defensive Cohesion:** Calculating the maximum number of team Pokémon weak to a single attack type.

## 2. Final Ensemble Strategies

We compared methods to combine the predictions of the three base models.

### 2.1. Method 1: Stacking Meta-Models

We implemented a "Level 1" stacking ensemble by training meta-models on the cross-validated (OOF) predictions from the base models. For each base model, OOF predictions were generated using a 10-fold StratifiedKFold. These were then saved as .npz files and stacked to form the final "meta-training" dataset. This process generated two separate submissions:

**1a. Logistic Regression Model** A dedicated **Logistic Regression** model was trained on the OOF predictions. This model learns optimal linear weights for combining the base models and was used to create one submission file.

**1b. Best Model Selection** Separately, we conducted a comparison to find the best meta-model. We trained and evaluated several models on the OOF data: **Logistic Regression**, **RidgeCV**, a **LightGBM (L1) model**, a **'Hard' Voting Classifier**, and a **'Soft' Voting Classifier**. The model with the highest OOF accuracy was saved as the **'BEST'** model for a separate submission.

### 2.2. Method 2: Simple Blending

As an alternative, we implemented a simple blending ensemble. This method loaded the final probability .csv files from all three models and calculated an equal-weighted (1/3) average for the final prediction.

### 2.3. Final Submissions

Our three final submissions reflect these distinct strategies:

1. submission\_stacking\_logreg\_3models.csv
2. submission\_stacking\_BEST\_L1\_model.csv
3. submission\_blended\_LGBM\_CAT\_XGB\_CLASS.csv